

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

**TRANSLATION**  
**PCT**

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

<p>To:</p>		<p>Date of mailing (day/month/year)</p>
<p>Applicant's or agent's file reference <b>M17PCT11</b></p>		<p><b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b> See paragraph 2 below</p>
<p>International application No. <b>PCT/JP2005/011525</b></p>	<p>International filing date (day/month/year) <b>23.06.2005</b></p>	<p>Priority date (day/month/year)</p>
<p>International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC</p>		
<p>Applicant <b>KANAI, Takashi</b></p>		

<p>1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 5%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 25%;">Box No. I</td> <td>Basis of the opinion</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																							
<p>2. <b>FURTHER ACTION</b></p> <p>If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.</p> <p>If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.</p> <p>For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.</p>																									
<p>3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.</p>																									

<p>Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP</p>	<p>Authorized officer</p>
<p>Facsimile No.</p>	<p>Telephone No.</p>

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/011525

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language  
\_\_\_\_\_, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material  
☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material  
☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing  
☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/011525

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
<b>1. Statement</b>			
Novelty (N)	Claims	2-4	YES
	Claims	1	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-4	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-4	YES
	Claims		NO
<b>2. Citations and explanations:</b>			
<p>The following documents are cited in the ISR:</p> <p>Document 1: JP 2004-92446 A (NIDEC Corp.), 25 March 2004, paragraph 0043; Figs. 1-18</p> <p>Document 2: JP 2000-341907 A (NSK Ltd.), 08 December 2000, claims; Figs. 2 and 4</p> <p>Document 3: JP 1-249989 A (Ebara Corp.), 05 October 1989, page 4, upper left column; Fig. 1</p> <p>Document 4: JP 2001-107883 A (Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, Ltd.), 17 April 2001, paragraphs 0044-0045; Fig. 5</p> <p>Document 5: JP 2574573 B2 (Matsushita Seiko Co., Ltd.), 24 October 1996, claims; Fig. 4</p> <p>Document 6: JP 8-74785 A (Hitachi, Ltd.), 19 March 1996, claims; Fig. 2</p> <p>The invention of claim 1 does not appear to possess novelty based on documents 1 and 2. Document 1 discloses a blower provided with a case with an air suction opening formed on at least one side and a discharge opening formed in a peripheral wall, a motor using a fluid dynamic bearing, and a vaned wheel fixed to a rotating member of the motor. Document 2 also discloses a blower of the same kind as document 1.</p> <p>The invention of claim 2 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1-4. As disclosed in document 3 (spiral groove and magnet) and in document 4 (balance mechanism), means for prevention of excessive impeller movement in thrust direction to prevent contact with the case are well known.</p> <p>The invention of claim 3 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1-2 and 5-6. Installing a soundproofing mechanism at the suction opening of an impeller is a well-known technique, as disclosed in documents 5 and 6, and it can be installed as required.</p> <p>The invention of claim 4 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on documents 1-6 (refer to the reason why claims 1-3 do not appear to involve an inventive step).</p>			